arXiv:1304.7409v1 [quant-ph] 27 Apr 2013

Bell inequalities under one sided relaxation of physical constraints

Biswajit Paul,[1, *] Kaushiki Mukherjee,[2, †] and Debasis Sarkar[2, ‡]
[1]*Department of Mathematics, St.Thomas' College of Engineering and Technology,*
4,Diamond Harbour Road,Alipore, Kolkata-700023, India.
[2]*Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Calcutta, 92, A.P.C. Road, Kolkata-700009, India.*
(Dated: April 30, 2013)

It is known that Bell inequalities are violated by quantum mechanics. So, one of the properties, like, determinism, no signaling and measurement independence which are required for framing Bell inequality, is incompatible with quantum correlations. Thus, any model simulating quantum correlations must either individually or jointly give up these physical constraints. Recently, M. J. W. Hall (Phys Review A, **84**, 022102 (2011)) derived different forms of Bell inequalities under the assumption of individual or joint relaxation of those physical properties on both sides. One sided relaxation can also be a useful resource for simulating singlet correlations. For that we have derived a Bell-type inequality under the assumption of joint relaxation of determinism and no signaling on one side. It is shown that for the previous case, if we increase measurement settings per party, then the Bell-type inequality takes a different form. We also relaxed no signaling, determinism and measurement independence all at the same time on one side and framed corresponding Bell-type inequality. In each case, we have obtained the minimum degree of relaxation of these physical properties for any model which violates a standard Bell inequality.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

In 1964, John S. Bell introduced an *inequality* [1] thereby showing *no realistic physical theory which is also local in a specified sense can agree with all of the statistical implications of Quantum Mechanics* (under conditions which were relaxed in later work by Bell [2–4] himself and also by others [5–8]). Different versions of the theorem, inspired by the 1964 paper [1], are considered as a family which is uniquely termed as "*Bell's Thoerem*" and the corresponding inequalities are termed as "*Bell-type inequalities*". Each of these inequalities is statistical in nature. Violation of any "*Bell-type inequality*" thus may be considered as one of the remarkable features of quantum theory. Till date violation of Bell inequality serves various objectives in the context of better understanding of the behaviour of composite quantum systems. For example, it serves as a criteria necessary for categorizing correlations, helps us in quantifying nonlocality, etc.

Various plausible physical postulates are at the background of framing Bell inequalities. Some of the physical constraints in this regard are: no signaling constraints, measurement independence, locality, determinism, etc., (these constraints are discussed briefly later in this paper in section (II)). Hence, violation of these inequalities by any physical theory thereby give rise to some queries: *are the predictions made by the theory incorrect?* or, *whether at least one of these applied postulates incompatible with the description of the natural phenomena?* As Quantum mechanical predictions tally with the experimental data so only the second query is relevant in this regard. Till now various literatures have dealt with the relaxation of physical constraints for framing Bell inequalities [9–14]. In [11], M.J.W.Hall considered relaxation of measurement independence. He argued that for violation of Bell-CHSH inequality by any singlet correlations at least 86% percentage of measurement independence must be relaxed. In [12], he introduced a Bell inequality considering joint relaxation of no signaling and determinism thereby focusing on the complementary relationship shared by signaling and indeterminism by any physical model. He showed that at least 60% of signaling and 41% of indeterminism must be introduced in the Bell-CHSH model to justify the violation shown by singlet correlations. In [13], a relaxed Bell-type inequality was introduced under the assumption of joint relaxation of no signaling, determinism and measurement independence. The main objective of all these papers [11–13] was to simulate singlet correlations assuming both side relaxation of these physical constraints. The question

---

[*] Electronic address: biswajitpaul4@gmail.com
[†] Electronic address: kaushiki_mukherjee@rediffmail.com
[‡] Electronic address: dsappmath@caluniv.ac.in

that naturally arises in this context is, whether relaxation of these physical properties on one side can simulate singlet correlations? In [14], Banik et. al., dealt with one sided relaxation of measurement independence. It was shown that 59% of measurement independence by one of the two parties was optimal to generate singlet correlations.

In this paper, we have investigated whether relaxation of one sided no signaling is more useful as a resource for simulation of singlet correlations than that of both sided relaxation of the same. We have succeeded in showing that the minimum degree of relaxation has decreased from 60% to 17%. The *complementary relation* [12] between determinism and signaling remains invariant in this case. We also investigate one sided joint relaxation of no signaling, determinism and measurement independence. Interestingly, for one sided relaxation, maximal violation of Bell inequality cannot be achieved unlike that in the case of both sided relaxation [12, 13]. Moreover, depending on the *complementary relation*, we obtain two subintervals (2,3) and (2,4) of the total violation (2,4].

The paper is organized as follows: in section (II) we describe some preliminary notions required for our discussion. A relaxed Bell-type inequality under the assumption of joint one sided relaxation of determinism and no signaling is given in section (III). In section (IV), the Bell-type inequality gets modified when we consider one sided relaxation of measurement independence along with the pre-existing assumptions of section (III). In section (V), we investigate whether the form of inequality (in section III) remain the same or changes when the number of settings per party is increased. Finally, we concluded in section (VI).

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Model Behind Any Experiment

Consider a joint experiment between two parties, Alice and Bob. Suppose each party has dichotomic measurement settings with inputs x and y for Alice and Bob respectively. Let a and $b \in \{-1, 1\}$ label the possible outcomes of Alice and Bob respectively. The results of this experiment can be expressed in terms of the statistical correlations $p(a,\, b|\, x,\, y)$. Now, for correlations corresponding to any experiment, there always exists an underlying model that depends upon a variable λ (say), frequently referred to as hidden variable. Thus the correlations thereby depend on this underlying variable λ and by Bayes' theorem one has the identity:

$$p(a,\, b|x,\, y) \,=\, \int d\lambda\, p(a,\, b|x,\, y,\, \lambda)\, p(\lambda|x,\, y). \tag{1}$$

If λ has a discrete range of values, then integration would be replaced by summation.

In the standard Hilbert space model of quantum mechanics, one can consider the underlying variable λ as the density operator ρ and the joint measurement setting by a POVM M^{xy}_{ab} with

$$p(a,\, b|x,\, y,\, \rho) \,=\, tr[\rho M^{xy}_{ab}], \quad p(\rho|x,\, y) \,=\, \delta(\rho - \rho_0). \tag{2}$$

Using a pure state one can also get,

$$p(a,\, b|x,\, y,\, \psi) \,=\, \langle\psi|M^{xy}_{ab}|\psi\rangle, \quad p(\psi|x,\, y) \,=\, p_0(\psi) \tag{3}$$

where the hidden variable λ being confined to the set of unit vectors $\{|\psi\rangle\}$ of the Hilbert space and $\rho_0 \equiv \int d\psi p_0(\psi)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

Relaxation of physical constraints: Given a model behind an experiment, it may or may not satisfy various physically acceptable properties, such as locality, no signaling, determinism, measurement independence, etc. For instance, one may consider a model of singlet correlations. Such a model violates Bell inequalities implying that at least one of the aforementioned physical constraints must be relaxed to frame a model of these type of quantum correlations. The necessary degrees of relaxation of the above properties to model quantum correlations were derived in [11–13]. In this work, we also deal with the task of relaxing one or more physical constraints in a slightly different approach. Before going into the main results, we briefly overview those above constraints and other prerequisites.

B. No signaling

In a system of distant parties if we assume that no communication among the parties can take place when the measurements are performed, then the obtained correlations must obey the principle of no signaling: *the choices of observable by one party cannot influence the statistics observed by the remaining parties.*

In other words, consider the previously mentioned system of two parties Alice and Bob, the condition of no signaling is satisfied if the underlying marginal distributions associated with the setting of one party does not depend on that with the setting of the other party, i.e., if

$$p(a|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,=\, p(a|x,\, y',\, \lambda), \quad p(b|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,=\, p(b|x',\, y,\, \lambda) \tag{4}$$

for all pairs $(x,\, y)$, $(x,\, y')$ and $(x',\, y)$ of the model. For Hilbert space models this property is satisfied when the measure in equation (2) has the tensor product form $M_{ab}^{xy} \,=\, M_a^x \bigotimes M_b^y$.

Relaxation:- Signaling. Though relativistic causality is a natural constraint on any physical model, still it may be possible (at least theoretically) to construct models and hence resolve apparent paradoxes if it does not hold. Thus one may think of relaxing the principle of no signaling in any model and thereby introducing signaling.

The degree of signaling is defined by the maximum shift possible in an underlying marginal probability for one observer, due to the alteration of measurement setting of the other.

One may formulate it as follows [12, 13]:

$$S_{1\to 2} \,:=\, \sup_{x,x',y,b,\lambda} |\, p^{(2)}(b|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,-\, p^{(2)}(b|x',\, y,\, \lambda)\,| \tag{5}$$

$$S_{2\to 1} \,:=\, \sup_{x,y,y',a,\lambda} |\, p^{(1)}(a|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,-\, p^{(1)}(a|x,\, y',\, \lambda)\,| \tag{6}$$

where $a,\, b,\, x, x', y$ and y' have their usual meanings. According to the definition, $S_{1\to 2}$ is the maximum possible deviation in an underlying marginal probability distribution for the second observer, induced via the change of a measurement settings of the first observer. Given λ, if $S_{1\to 2} \,>\, 0$, then the first observer in principle can send a signal to the second observer by merely altering its own measurement setting and hence communicating faster than the speed of light.

The overall degree of signaling, for a given underlying model is defined by,

$$S := \mathit{max}\,\{S_{1\to 2},\, S_{2\to 1}\}. \tag{7}$$

C. Determinism

A model is said to be deterministic if the observed statistical correlations are generated by averaging over a set of all possible values of the underlying variable (λ) such that for any fixed value of the variable(λ) all measurement outcomes are fully determined [12].

In a deterministic correlation model all the outcomes being predictable with certainty for any given knowledge of λ, correlation terms are either 0 or 1, i.e., $p(a,\, b|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,\in \{0,\, 1\}$. From this it can be easily shown that the underlying marginal probabilities are deterministic, i.e.,

$$p(a,|x,\, y,\, \lambda),\, p(b,|x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,\in \{0,\, 1\}. \tag{8}$$

Relaxation:- Indeterminism. The degree of indeterminism of an underlying model may be defined as the measure of deviation of the marginal probabilities from the deterministic values of 0 and 1 in relation (8). The local degree of indeterminism I_j may be defined [12, 13] as the smallest positive number, such that the corresponding marginal probabilities lie in $[0,\, I_j] \bigcup [1 - I_j, 1]$, i.e.,

$$I_j \,:=\, \sup_{\{x,\, y,\, \lambda\}} \, \min_z \{p^j(z|x,\, y,\, \lambda),\, 1 - \, p^j(z|x,\, y,\, \lambda)\}. \tag{9}$$

Hence $I_j \,= 0$ if and only if the corresponding marginal is deterministic.

The overall degrees of indeterminism for the model may be defined as,

$$I \,:=\, \mathit{max}\{I_1,\, I_2\}. \tag{10}$$

Hence $0 \leq\, I\, \leq 1/2$, with $I \,= 0$ if the model is fully deterministic.

If a model of two parties be such that the determinism is relaxed for the second party while the measurement outcomes of the first party are deterministic, then such a model is said to be the *one sided indeterministic* model. In such a model

$$\begin{gathered} I_1 \,= 0, \quad 0 \,< I_2 \,\leq\, 1/2. \\ \text{Hence, } I \,=\, I_2. \end{gathered} \tag{11}$$

A Complementary Relation Between Signaling And Determinism: The degrees of indeterminism and signalling are dependent on each other to some extent. This is due to the fact that any deviation in a marginal probability value p, due to signaling, must either keep the value in the same subinterval $[0,\, I]$ (or, $[1-I,\, 1]$) $(S \leq I)$, or shift the value across the gap between the subintervals $(S \geq 1-2I)$ which leads to

$$I \geq min\{\, S,\, (1-S)/2\,\}. \tag{12}$$

D. Measurement Independence

Measurement independence of a model, as the name suggests, is the property that the distribution of the underlying variable is independent of the measurement settings chosen by the experimenters. Alternatively, it implies that experimenters can freely choose from a set of possible measurement settings irrespective of the underlying variable λ describing the system. More specifically, if the experimenters adopt certain measures to determine measurement settings (for instance using random number generators), then those measurement settings will be independent of the variable λ describing the system. As the statistics of the underlying variable λ do not depend on the measurement settings, then,

$$p(\lambda|x,\, y) \,=\, p(\lambda|x',\, y') \tag{13}$$

for every joint settings $(x,\, y)$, $(x',\, y')$. This condition is satisfied by quantum system in Eq. (2).
By Bayes' theorem, the alternate formulation of the property can be obtained as below,

$$p(x,\, y|\lambda) \,=\, p(x,\, y), \quad p(x,\, y,\, \lambda) \,=\, p(x,\, y)\, p(\lambda) \tag{14}$$

assuming the existence of a well defined distribution $p(x,\, y)$ of joint measurement settings [13].
Thus, *Measurement dependence(M)* may be interpreted as a measure to quantify the degree of violation of measurement independence by the underlying model. It is defined as [11]:

$$M := \sup_{x,x',y,y'} \int d\lambda\, |p(\lambda|x,\, y) \,-\, p(\lambda|x',\, y')|. \tag{15}$$

Therefore, if eqn.(13) holds, then $M \,=\, 0$. On the contrary, the maximum possible value of M is given by $M_{max} \,=\, 2$ implying complete measurement dependence in this case.
The fraction of measurement independence corresponding to a given model is defined by [11],

$$F := 1 \,-\, M/2. \tag{16}$$

Thus $0 \leq F \leq 1$, with $F \,=\, 0$ for the case where $M \,=\, 2$. Geometrically, F represents the minimum degree of overlap between any two underlying distributions $p(\lambda|x,\, y)$ and $p(\lambda|x',\, y')$.
Also, local degrees of measurement dependence are defined analogously [11],

$$M_1 := \sup_{x,x',y} \int d\lambda\, |p(\lambda|x,\, y) \,-\, p(\lambda|x',\, y)|; \quad M_2 := \sup_{x,y,y'} \int d\lambda\, |p(\lambda|x,\, y) \,-\, p(\lambda|x,\, y')|. \tag{17}$$

So, local degrees of measurement independence are defined by,

$$F_1 := 1 \,-\, M_1/2; \qquad F_2 := 1 \,-\, M_2/2. \tag{18}$$

III. BELL INEQUALITY UNDER RELAXATION OF DETERMINISM AND NO SIGNALING ON ONE SIDE

In [1], J.S.Bell considered a deterministic and no signaling model to frame the Bell Inequality. In order to generate models violating that inequality, the properties of no signaling and that of determinism are relaxed to some extent, thereby introducing signaling and indeterminism in the models. The extent of relaxation of these two properties can be quantified with the help of the corresponding relaxed Bell-type inequality [12]. Below we describe a model where one sided signaling and indeterminism are introduced.

In a system of two parties (Alice and Bob), it is assumed that determinism and no signaling are preserved by the correlations shown by Alice's measurement. A signal is sent to Bob by Alice and it is also assumed that the correlations in Bob's part are indeterministic. So for this model $S = S_{1\to 2}$ and $I = I_2$ by Eq. (11). The extent of minimum possible relaxation in this context is given by the following theorem.

Theorem 1: Let x, x' and y, y' denote possible measurement settings for Alice and Bob, respectively, and label each measurement outcome by 1 or -1. Suppose, $\langle XY\rangle$ being the average product of the measurement outcomes for joint measurement settings. Then, for any underlying model having values of indeterminism and signalling of at most I and S, respectively, Bell inequality takes the form:

$$\langle XY\rangle + \langle XY'\rangle + \langle X'Y\rangle - \langle X'Y'\rangle \leq B(I,\, S) \tag{19}$$

with upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} B(I,\, S) &= 2 + 2I \qquad && \text{for} \quad S < 1 - 2I\, \text{(tight upper bound)}, \\ &< 4 && \text{for} \quad S \geq 1 - 2I. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

(Proof: see Appendix A)
We have immediately the following implications:

- Original form of Bell inequality is derivable with $I = S = 0$, i.e., $B(0,\, 0) = 2$.
- *Degree of relaxation for V, the amount of violation:* Suppose, the Bell-CHSH inequality be violated by an amount V. The left hand side of Eq.(19) gives $2 + V$. Hence the corresponding model must satisfy the relation

  $$B(I,\, S) \geq 2 + V. \tag{21}$$

  By Eq.(20), the above equation (Eq. 21) is equivalent to,

  $$I \geq I_V := V/2 \qquad \text{and/or} \qquad S \geq S_V := 1 - V. \tag{22}$$

  This theorem, thus exerts bounds on the minimum possible degrees of indeterminism and signalling that must exist in any corresponding model.
- *Degree of relaxation for generation of singlet state correlations:* For singlet state correlations, $V = 2\sqrt{2} - 2$ [15]. Thus Eq.(22) implies that any singlet state model must assign at least 82% of indeterminism, and/or communicating at least 17% of signaling. in some underlying spin probability for one party in response to a measurement performed on the other party.
- *Can Maximal Violation Be Reached?* For $I = 0$ and/or $S = 1$, $B(I,\, S) = 4$ (See Appendix A). But in that case Bob's outcome correlations become deterministic. Hence, unlike the case of both sided relaxation on no signaling and determinism [12], for one sided signaling and indeterminism maximal violation cannot be reached.
- *Division of the range of violation:* Depending on the complementary relation between indeterminism and signaling, we get two subintervals $\mathfrak{R}_1$ and $\mathfrak{R}_2$ of the interval $\mathfrak{R} = (2\,,\, 4]$ of violation. For $S < 1 - 2I$, $\mathfrak{R}_1 = (2\,,\, 3)$. For $S \geq 1 - 2I$, we get the other subinterval $\mathfrak{R}_2 = (2\,,\, 4)$.

IV. BELL INEQUALITIES UNDER RELAXATION OF DETERMINISM, NO SIGNALING AND MEASUREMENT INDEPENDENCE ON ONE SIDE

In this section, a relaxed Bell-type inequality is framed to investigate the extent to which Bell inequalities are violated when jointly no signaling, determinism and measurement independence are relaxed from one side. This quantifies the amount of individual and/or joint degrees of relaxation required to model a given violation of a standard Bell inequality. Without loss of generality, we assume that joint relaxation is done only on Bob's side, i.e., $I_2 > 0$, $S_{1\to 2} > 0$ and $M_2 > 0$, whereas at the same time Alice maintains $I_1 = 0$, $S_{2\to 1} = 0$ and $M_1 = 0$. Thus, $I > 0$ and $S > 0$.

Theorem 2: Suppose, x, x' and y, y' be the measurement settings for Alice and Bob respectively and the measurement outcomes for each party be 1 or -1. If $\langle XY\rangle$ denote the average of the product of the measurement outcomes for joint measurement settings X and Y, then

$$\langle XY\rangle + \langle XY'\rangle + \langle X'Y\rangle + \langle X'Y'\rangle \leq B(I, S, M) \tag{23}$$

where I, S and M are the values of indeterminism, signaling and measurement dependence respectively, for any underlying models.

$$\begin{array}{ll} B(I,S,M) = 4-(1-I)(2-M), & \text{for} \quad S<1-2I \text{ and } M<2 \, \text{(tight upper bound)} \\ \qquad\qquad\quad < 4, & \text{otherwise.} \end{array} \tag{24}$$

(Proof: see Appendix B)
We have then the following immediate implications:

- Bell-CHSH inequality is derivable for $I = S = M = 0$, i.e., $B(0,\, 0,\, 0) = 2$.
- *Degree of relaxation for violation of CHSH inequality by V amount:* Let the Bell-CHSH inequality be violated by an amount V. The left hand side of Eq.(23) gives $2+V$. Hence, the corresponding model must satisfy the relation

  $$B(I,\, S,\, M) \geq 2 + V. \tag{25}$$

  By Eq.(23) the above equation (25) is equivalent to

  $$I \geq I_V := V/2 \qquad \text{and/or} \qquad S \geq S_V := 1 - V \qquad \text{and/or} \qquad M_V \geq V. \tag{26}$$

  Hence if any model violate the CHSH inequality by an amount V, then by applying our theorem one can easily find out the minimum degrees of indeterminism, signaling, measurement dependence that must be required on one side in the corresponding model.
- *Measurement independence model:* Measurement independence model can be obtained from the above theorem if we consider, $M = 0$. This case has been already discussed in the previous section. Hence the previous theorem is also a particular case of this theorem.
- *Degree of relaxation for generation of singlet state correlations:* Here $V = 2\sqrt{2} - 2$ [15]. Thus Eq.(26) implies that any singlet state model must either assign at least 82% of uncertainty and/or predict a change of at least 17% and/or relax measurement independence by 59% for one party in response to a measurement performed on the other party.
- *Local deterministic model:* In this case, both $I = 0$ and $S = 0$. Equation (24) reduces to,

  $$B(0,\, 0,\, M) = min\{2 + M, 4\}. \tag{27}$$

  Hence from Eq. (26), a local deterministic model exists for simulating a singlet state correlation if and only if $M \geq V = 2\sqrt{2} - 2 \approx 0.82$. So 59% measurement independence is optimal for simulating singlet correlation when measurement dependency is allowed only on one side.
  These results have been obtained in a recent paper [14]. So, our relaxed Bell inequality gives (Eq. (23) and (24)) a general result from which results of [14] can be obtained as a particular case.
- *Can Maximal Violation Be Reached?* For $I = 0$ and/or $S = 1$, and/or $M = 2$, $B(I,\, S,\, M) = 4$ (See Appendix B). But in that case Bob's outcome correlations become deterministic and/or fully measurement independent. Hence, unlike the case of both sided relaxation of no signaling, measurement dependence and determinism [13], for one sided signaling, indeterminism and measurement dependence, maximal violation cannot be reached.
- *Division of the range of violation:* Like the previous scenario, in this case also, we obtain two subintervals $\mathfrak{R}_1$ and $\mathfrak{R}_2$ of the interval $\mathfrak{R} = (2\,,\, 4]$ of violation. For $S < 1 - 2I$, $\mathfrak{R}_1 = (2\,,\, 3)$. For $S \geq 1 - 2I$, we get the other subinterval $\mathfrak{R}_2 = (2\,,\, 4)$.

V. RELAXED BELL INEQUALITIES FOR MORE THAN TWO SETTINGS

A suitable form of Bell inequality for the case of three measurement settings and binary outcomes obtained by M. J. W. Hall [13] is considered here:

$$A_{3322} = \sum_{j,k} \alpha_{jk} \langle X_j Y_k \rangle \leq 4, \tag{28}$$

where $\alpha_{jk} = 1$ for $j+k \leq 4$, $\alpha_{23} = \alpha_{32} = -1$, $\alpha_{33} = 0$ and $\langle X_j Y_k \rangle$ denotes the average of the product of the measurement outcomes, for joint measurement settings x_j and y_k.

We jointly relax here no signaling and determinism on Bob's side.

Theorem 3: If joint relaxation is done only on one side, then the relaxed Bell inequality corresponding to (28) is,

$$\begin{aligned} A_{3322}(\lambda) \leq B_{3322}(I,S) &= 4+4I, && \text{for} \quad S < 1-2I \,(\text{tight upper bound}) \\ &< 8, && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where I and S are the values of indeterminism and signaling of the underlying model.

(Proof: see Appendix C)
We have immediately the following implications:

- Original form of Bell inequality (28)is derivable with $I = S = 0$, i.e., $B_{3322}(0,\,0) = 4$.
- In this case the upper bound is twice the upper bound obtained in *Theorem 1*.
- Eq. (29) implies that for $S < 1-2I$, value of $B_{3322}(I,S)$ lies in $[4,\ 6)$ while for $S \geq 1-2I$ it lies in $[4, 8)$.

Now we consider the general scenario where both the parties have $m > 3$, number of measurement settings. Here, the Bell inequality is of the form:

$$A_{mm22} = \sum_{j,k=1}^{m} \alpha_{jk}^{(m)} \langle X_j Y_k \rangle \leq \frac{1}{2} m(m-1) + 1 \tag{30}$$

where $\alpha_{jk}^{(m)} = 1$ for $j+k \leq m+1$, $\alpha_{jk}^{(m)} = -1$ for $j+k = m+2$ and $\alpha_{jk}^{(m)} = 0$ otherwise. We conjecture that the corresponding relaxed Bell inequality is

$$A_{mm22}(I,S) \leq B_{mm22}(I,S) \tag{31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_{mm22}(I,S) &= \frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m+4I)+1, && for \quad S < 1-2I \,(\text{tight upper bound}) \\ &< \frac{1}{2}(m-1)(m+4)+1, && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

For $S < 1-2I$, equality is obtained via the choices:$m_{jk} = 0$, $n_{jk} = 0$ for $j+k \leq m+1$ and $n_{jk} = I$ for $j+k = m+2$. Eq.(29) and Eq.(20) can be deduced from the above conjecture for $m = 3$ and $m = 2$ respectively.
Combination of both sided and one sided relaxation: Till now all the problems considered in this paper, have been done under the assumption of one sided relaxation. A natural extension of this work is to ask what will happen if we take the combination of both sided and one sided relaxation.
If we consider both sided relaxation of determinism, no signaling and one sided relaxation of measurement independence, then we find that the upper bound of Eq. (23) has the form

$$\begin{aligned} B(I,S,M) &= 4-(1-2I)(2-M), && \text{for} \quad S < 1-2I \text{ and } M < 2 \,(\text{tight upper bound}) \\ &= 4, && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Similarly, one can consider one sided relaxation on determinism, no signaling and both sided relaxation of measurement independence. In this case, upper bound of Eq. (23) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} B(I,S,M) &= 4-(1-I)(2-3M), && \text{for} \quad S < 1-2I \text{ and } M < \frac{2}{3} \,(\text{tight upper bound}) \\ &< 4, && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

VI. CONCLUSION

Relaxation of physical constraints while modeling Bell inequality has been a subject of discussion for long time. The main aim of these types of discussions is to demonstrate that certain sets of plausible physical properties are incompatible with quantum correlations. In particular, any violation of a Bell inequality requires that at least one of these plausible properties must be relaxed. So far *relaxed Bell-type inequalities* were modeled under the assumption of both sided relaxation of one or more than one physical constraints at a time [11–13]. In [14], we find the minimal degree of relaxation of one sided measurement independence. Here we have considered only one sided relaxation of constraints such as no signaling, determinism and measurement independence and have framed Bell-type inequalities under such assumptions. Firstly, we have considered one sided simultaneous relaxation of signaling and indeterminism. Then we relaxed no signaling, determinism and measurement independence all at the same time on one side and also derived Bell inequality by considering one sided measurement dependence separately. We gave relaxed Bell-type inequality in more than two setting scenario. Now, with the view of all discussed in this paper, we can safely conclude that the results derived in one sided relaxation scenarios do not tally exactly with that of in the both sided cases. The existing complementary relation between both sided signaling and indeterminism also holds in the one sided case. But the minimal degree of relaxation of the constraints in the one sided cases differ from that of both sided cases. The form of *relaxed Bell-type inequalities* have also changed. There still remain many other topics of discussion in the context of one sided relaxation of physical constraints. For instance, one may consider one sided outcome dependence, its relation (if any) with the other relaxed constraints such as measurement dependence, signaling, etc., which in turn generate the study of quantum correlations further.

Acknowledgement: The authors thank Ajoy Sen for interesting and helpful discussions relating to the topic of this work. This work is supported by University Grants Commission(UGC), New Delhi.

[1] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).
[2] J.S. Bell, “Introduction to the hidden-variable question,” in Foundations of Quantum Mechanics (Proceedings of the International School of Physics ‘Enrico Fermi’, course IL), B. d’Espagnat (ed.), New York: Academic, 171–181 (1971).
[3] J.S. Bell, “The theory of local beables,” Dialectica, **39**: 97–102 (1985).
[4] J.S. Bell, Speakable and Unspeakable in Quantum Mechanics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, revised edition, 2004. (Contains reprints of the preceding and related papers (1987).
[5] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, A. Shimony, and R. A. Holt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **23** 880-884 (1969).
[6] J. F. Clauser, M. A. Horne, Phys. Rev. D, **10**, 526 (1974).
[7] N.D. Mermin, “Generalizations of Bell’s Theorem to higher spins and higher correlations,” in Fundamental Questions in Quantum Mechanics, L.M. Roth and A. Inomato (eds.), New York: Gordon and Breach, 7–20 (1986).
[8] A.Aspect, Trois tests expérimentaux des inégalités de Bell par mesure de corrélation de polarization de photons, Orsay: Thèse d’Etat (1983).
[9] C. Branciard et al., Nature Physics **4**, 681 (2008).
[10] Jonathan Barrett and Nicolas Gisin Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 100406 (2011)..
[11] M.J.W. Hall, Phys. Rev. Lett.**105**, 250404 (2010).
[12] M.J.W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 062117 (2010).
[13] M.J.W. Hall, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 022102 (2011).
[14] Manik Banik, MD Rajjak Gazi, Subhadipa Das, Ashutosh Rai, Samir Kunkri, J. Phys. A: Math Theor. **45**, 475302 (2012).
[15] B.S. Csirel’son, Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).

VII. APPENDIX

Appendix A: Proof of Theorem 1.

The proof is like in [12]. The outcomes of Alice and Bob are labeled by ±1. Let, the joint measurement outcomes are ordered like $(+,+)$, $(+,-)$, $(-,+)$ and $(-,-)$.
Let $p(+,+|x,\,y,\,\lambda) = c$; $p^{(1)}(+|x,\,y,\,\lambda) = m$ and $p^{(2)}(+|x,\,y,\,\lambda) = n$. Hence if $\langle XY\rangle_\lambda$ denotes the average product of the measurement outcomes for a fixed value of λ, then $\langle XY\rangle_\lambda = 1 + 4c - 2(m+n)$ [12]. Due to positivity of the joint probabilities, $\max\{0,\, m+n-1\} \leq c \leq \min\{m,\, n\}$. Thus,

$$2|m+n-1| - 1 \leq \langle XY\rangle_\lambda \leq 1 - 2|m-n|. \tag{35}$$

For suitable choices of c we can obtain upper and lower bounds.
Let, $p_1 \equiv p(*|x,\, y)$, $p_2 \equiv p(*|x,\, y')$, $p_3 \equiv p(*|x',\, y)$ and $p_4 \equiv p(*|x',\, y')$;

$$E(\lambda) := \langle XY\rangle_\lambda + \langle XY'\rangle_\lambda + \langle X'Y\rangle_\lambda - \langle X'Y'\rangle_\lambda,$$

then,

$$E(\lambda) \leq 4 - 2J, \tag{36}$$

where

$$J = |m_1 - n_1| + |m_2 - n_2| + |m_3 - n_3| + |m_4 + n_4 - 1|. \tag{37}$$

For suitable choices of c_1, c_2, c_3 and c_4 the upper bound is attainable.
As Alice's correlations abide by no signaling principle, $m_1 = m_2$ and $m_3 = m_4$. Therefore,

$$J = |m_1 - n_1| + |m_1 - n_2| + |m_3 - n_3| + |m_3 + n_4 - 1|. \tag{38}$$

Due to determinism on Alice's part, $m_1,\, m_3 \in \{0,\, 1\}$. The indeterminism and signalling constraints of the theorem on Bob's outcomes imply $n_j \in [0,\, I] \bigcup [1-I,\, 1] \quad \forall \text{j} = 1,2,3,4$ and $|n_1 - n_3| \leq S$; $|n_2 - n_4| \leq S$.
To maximize $E(\lambda)$, J must be minimized. Firstly, let $S < 1 - 2I$. Then each pair $\{n_1,\, n_3\}$ and $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [0,\, I]$ or $[1-I,\, 1]$. There are four possible cases corresponding to the four possible values of $(m_1,\, m_3)$: $(0,0)$,$(1,\,0)$, $(0,1)$ and $(1,\,1)$. Under each of the four possible cases the possible subcases are:

- $\{n_1,\, n_3\}$, $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [0,\, I]$
- $\{n_1,\, n_3\} \in [0,\, I]$, $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [1-I,\, 1]$
- $\{n_1,\, n_3\} \in [1-I,\, 1]$, $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [0,\, I]$
- $\{n_1,\, n_3\}$, $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [1-I,\, 1]$

Considering all the possible cases and subcases, we have, $J \geq |1-I|$. Equality is obtained for some suitable choices of the values of m_j and n_j, $(j = 1,2,3,4)$: $m_1 = m_3 = 0$, $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0$, $n_4 = I$.
Hence, $E(\lambda) \leq 2(1+I)$ (the bound is tight).
Secondly, let $S \geq 1 - 2I$. Just as in the previous case, there are four possible values of $(m_1,\, m_3)$. The possible subcases are :

- $\{n_1,\, n_3\} \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$); $n_2 \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$), $n_4 \in [1-I,\, 1]$(or $[0,\, I]$)
- $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$); $n_1 \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$), $n_3 \in [1-I,\, 1]$(or $[0,\, I]$)
- $n_1 \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$), $n_3 \in [1-I,\, 1]$(or $[0,\, I]$); $n_2 \in [0,\, I]$(or $[1-I,\, 1]$), $n_4 \in [1-I,\, 1]$(or $[0,\, I]$)

For $m_1 = m_3 = 0$; $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0$, $n_4 = 1$, one gets $J = 0$. But in this case, Bob's outcomes become deterministic. Hence$(n_1,\, n_2,\, n_3,\, n_4) \neq (0,\, 0,\, 0,\, 1)$. Similarly, there are some other values of m_j and n_j(j=1,2,3,4) for which $J = 0$ is attainable, but in those cases Bob's outcomes become deterministic. Hence, $J > 0$ and $E(\lambda) < 4$. ■
For instance, upper bound $B(I,\, S)$ is saturated (for $S < 1 - 2I$) for $(I,\, I)$ box

$$p_1 \equiv p_2 \equiv p_3 \equiv (0,\, 0,\, 0,\, 1)\,, p_4 \equiv (0,\, 0,\, I,\, 1-I).$$

Appendix. B: Proof of Theorem 2.

We start the derivation by defining

$$T(\lambda) = P_{xy}(\lambda)\langle XY\rangle + P_{xy'}(\lambda)\langle X'Y\rangle + P_{x'y}(\lambda)\langle X'Y\rangle - P_{x'y'}(\lambda)\langle X'Y'\rangle \tag{39}$$

where $p_{xy} = p(a,b|x,y,\lambda)$, $p_{xy'} = p(a,b|x,y',\lambda)$, etc., and $P_{xy} = p(\lambda|x,y)$, $P_{xy'} = p(\lambda|x,y')$, etc.
Now by Eq. (35) the above relation takes the form

$$T(\lambda) \leq P_{xy}(\lambda) + P_{xy'}(\lambda) + P_{x'y}(\lambda) + P_{x'y'}(\lambda) - 2J(\lambda) \tag{40}$$

where

$$J(\lambda) = P_{xy}(\lambda)|m_1 - n_1| + P_{xy'}(\lambda)|m_2 - n_2| + P_{x'y}(\lambda)|m_3 - n_3| + P_{x'y'}(\lambda)|m_4 + n_4 - 1|. \tag{41}$$

Here m_j, n_j and c_j all depend on the underlying variable λ.
From the statement of the theorem it is clear that the restrictions are

$$m_j \in \{0, 1\},\, n_j \in [0\,,\, I] \cup [1 - I\,,\, 1] \tag{42}$$

$$m_1 = m_2,\, m_3 = m_4 \tag{43}$$

$$|n_1 - n_3|, |n_2 - n_4| \le S \tag{44}$$

and

$$\int |P_{xy}(\lambda) - P_{xy'}(\lambda)|d\lambda, \int |P_{x'y}(\lambda) - P_{x'y'}(\lambda)|d\lambda \le M;\, P_{xy}(\lambda) = P_{x'y}(\lambda) \,\text{and}\, P_{xy'}(\lambda) = P_{x'y'}(\lambda). \tag{45}$$

Hence $J(\lambda)$ takes the form

$$J(\lambda) = P_{xy}(\lambda)|m_1 - n_1| + P_{xy'}(\lambda)|m_1 - n_2| + P_{xy}(\lambda)|m_3 - n_3| + P_{xy'}(\lambda)|m_3 + n_4 - 1|. \tag{46}$$

The left hand side of the Eq. (23) is obtained by integrating both sides of Eq. (39) over λ and using Eq.(40), hence

$$\langle XY\rangle + \langle XY'\rangle + \langle X'Y\rangle + \langle X'Y'\rangle = \int T(\lambda)d\lambda \le 4 - 2\int J(\lambda)d\lambda. \tag{47}$$

In order to get the maximum value of the left hand side of Eq. (41), we have to minimize the integral of the positive quantity $J(\lambda)$ under the restriction given in the statement of the theorem.

Firstly, let $S < 1 - 2I$. Then each pair $\{n_1,\, n_3\}$ and $\{n_2,\, n_4\} \in [0,\, I]$ or $[1 - I,\, 1]$. There are four possible cases corresponding to the four possible values of $(m_1,\, m_3)$: $(0, 0)$,$(1,\, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ and $(1,\, 1)$. Under each of the four possible cases there are four possible subcases (as discussed in Appendix A). Considering all possible cases and subcases it is easy to check that out of the four absolute terms at most three can be zero at a time and the addition of these four absolute terms has the minimum value of $1 - I$. For example, if we take, $n_j = 0$ and $n_4 = I$ in Eq. (45), then we get $J(\lambda) = P_{x'y'}(1 - I)$. Hence

$$J(\lambda) \ge (1 - I)\min\{P_{xy},\, P_{xy'}\}. \tag{48}$$

Eq. (47) becomes (by using (48))

$$\langle XY\rangle + \langle XY'\rangle + \langle X'Y\rangle + \langle X'Y'\rangle \le 4 - 2(1 - I)\int \min\{P_{xy},\, P_{xy'}\}d\lambda. \tag{49}$$

Now

$$\min\{P_{xy},\, P_{xy'}\} \;=\; \frac{1}{2}(P_{xy} + P_{xy'}) - \frac{1}{2}|P_{xy} - P_{xy'}|. \tag{50}$$

Hence

$$\int \min\{P_{xy}, P_{xy'}\}d\lambda \;\ge\; \max\{0, 1 - \frac{M}{2}\}. \tag{51}$$

Then, we get our required result for the case $S < 1 - 2I$ by using the above inequality in Eq. (49).

Secondly, let $S \ge 1 - 2I$. Just as in the previous case, there are four possible values of $(m_1,\, m_3)$ and corresponding to each possible value of $(m_1,\, m_3)$ there exist four possible subcases (see Appendix A). For $m_1 = m_3 = 0$; $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 0$, $n_4 = 1$, and/or $P_{xy} = P_{xy'} = 0$ one gets $J = 0$. But in this case Bob's outcomes become deterministic and measurement independent. Hence, $(n_1,\, n_2,\, n_3,\, n_4) \ne (0,\, 0,\, 0,\, 1)$ and/or $P_{xy} \ne P_{xy'}$. Similarly, there are some other cases for which $J = 0$ is attainable but in those cases Bob's outcomes become deterministic and/or measurement independent. Hence, $J > 0$ and $T(\lambda) < 4$. Thus, we get Eq. (24) as required. ■

Appendix C: Proof of Theorem 3.

The left hand side of the Eq. (29) can be written in the form (by using Eq. (35) and (28))

$$A_{3322}(\lambda) \leq 8 - 2K \tag{52}$$

where $K = \sum_{j+k\leq 4} |m_{jk} - n_{jk}| + |m_{23} + n_{23} - 1| + |m_{32} + n_{32} - 1|$.

Now, the minimum value of K has to be obtained under the restrictions, $m_{jk} \in \{0, 1\}$, $n_{jk} \in [0, I] \cup [1 - I, 1]$ and $m_{jk} = m_{jk'}$ and $|n_{jk} - n_{j'k}| \leq S$.
Define, $F_{jk} = |m_{jk} - n_{jk}|$ and $G_{jk} = |m_{jk} + n_{kj} - 1|$, then

$$2K = [F_{11} + F_{13} + F_{21} + G_{23}] + [F_{21} + F_{13} + F_{22} + G_{23}] + [F_{11} + F_{12} + F_{31} + G_{32}] + [F_{21} + F_{22} + F_{31} + G_{32}]. \tag{53}$$

Like in Appendix A, each term in the above Eq. (53) has a minimum value $(1 - I)$ for $S < 1 - 2I$ and is strictly greater than zero otherwise. For $S < 1 - 2I$, the left hand side of Eq. (29) takes the maximum value $4 + 4I$, when $m_{jk} = 0$, $n_{jk} = 0$ for $j + k \leq 4$ and $n_{jk} = I$ for $j + k = 5$, while for $S \geq 1 - 2I$ each term in the above Eq. (53) is strictly greater than zero. Hence Eq. (29) follows via Eq. (52). ■